

Message Text

PAGE 01 USUN N 01190 01 OF 02 040427 Z

14

ACTION IO-03

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ADP-00 EUR-10 L-02 NSCE-00 NSC-10 INR-09

INRE-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 PRS-01 MC-02 OTP-01 ACDA-10

SCI-03 PM-03 DODE-00 NASA-01 GAC-01 RSR-01 RSC-01

/073 W

----- 099803

P R 040350 Z APR 73

FM USMISSION USUN NEWYORK

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 7313

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USUN 1190

LIMDIS

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: TSPA, PFOR, UN, CA, FR, UR

SUBJ: OUTER SPACE LEGAL: FOUR- POWER DISCUSSION ON
REGISTRATION TREATY

REF: (A) STATE 060732 NOTAL

(B) USUN 1164 NOTAL

1. SUMMARY, US, CANAD A, FRANCE AND USSR DELS CONTINUED
PRIVATE DISCUSSION OF US AND CANADA- FRANCE REGISTRATION
TREATY PROPOSALS 3 APRIL AND CONCENTRATED ON WHAT TYPES
OF INFORMATION SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL
REGISTRY. ALTHOUGH IT IS TOO EARLY TO BE CERTAIN, THE
PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT TODAY WAS THE HINT THAT THE USSR
WILL BE CONSIDERABLY LESS FORTHCOMING THAN THE US IN
WILLINGNESS TO TRANSMIT A FAIR BODY OF DATA ON EACH
LAUNCHING, AND, IN ORDER TO TRY TO COVER ITSELF, THE
SOVIETS MAY PROPOSE THAT THE TREATY SHOULD CALL FOR CERTAIN
(EXTREMELY LIMITED) TYPES OF INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED
ON AN OBLIGATORY BASIS AND THEN LIST OTHER TYPES OF
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 01190 01 OF 02 040427 Z

INFORMATION THAT COULD BE SUBMITTED VOLUNTARILY. PRESUMABLY,
THE USSR WOULD SUBMIT THE LATTER INFORMATION

ONLY ON SUCH LAUNCHINGS AS MOLNIYA COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES. THE FOUR- POWER DISCUSSION WILL CONTINUE UNTIL A " FIST READYING" OF THE US AND CANADA - FRANCE TEXTS IS COMPLETED (WED AND THURS). MEANWHILE, THE COMMITTEE- WIDE REGISTRATION WORKING GROUP COMMENCES ON WED, THE MOON TREATY BEING PUT ASIDE UNTIL 11 APRIL. WE HOPE TO FOCUS THE WORKING GROUP ON LESS CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS PENDING A CLEARER PICTURE OF WHETHER, AND TO WHAT EXTENT, FOUR- POWER AGREEMENT WILL PROVE POSSIBLE.

2. DETAILS. WE APPRECIATE REFTTEL A WHICH IS MOST HELPFUL IN CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

3. FOUR POWERS MET FOR SECOND TIME DURING AM 3 APRIL AND TOOK UP INTERNATIONAL REGISTRY TO BE MAINTAINED BY UN SECRETARY- GENERAL. WE PRESSED CANADA- FRANCE TO ACCEPT US PROPOSAL THAT OBLIGATION TO REPORT SHOULD RELATE EXPRESSLY TO OBJECTS " LAUNCHED INTO EARTH ORBIT OR BEYOND". THEY AGREED. WE THEN URGED THAT THE OBLIGATION SHOULD BE TO REPORT " AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE" PER THE US PROPOSAL, RATHER THAN " AS SOON AS POSSIBLE" PER CANADA FRANCE, AND GAVE BY WAY OF EXAMPLE OUR DESIRE TO CONTINUE OUR MONTHLY REPORTING TRADITION RATHER THAN HAVING TO SEND A SEPARATE REPORT ON EACH INDIVIDUAL LAUNCHING. FRENCH REP CHARVET RESISTED FOR SOME TIME BUT EVENTUALLY SAID HE WOULD AGREE ON CONDITION THE US NOT RPT NOT INSIST ON STATING IN THE TREATY THAT REPORTING SHOULD BE AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE " AFTER LAUNCH". CHARVET SAID HE DOES NOT WANT TO " CONSECRATE THE PRINCIPLE OF POST- LAUNCH NOTIFICATION". HE UNDERSTANDS AND ACCEPTS THAT " THE US" SILL NOT GIVE INFORMATION PRIOR TO LAUNCHING AND FRANCE WOULD DO SO ONLY RARELY, BUT HE WANTS TO BE ABLE TO NOTIFY AT LEAST CERTAIN DETAILS IN ADVANCE OF A PARTICULAR LAUNCH " IF IT IS FEASIBLE". WE SAID WE WOULD HAVE TO REFER THIS POINT TO WASHINGTON.

4. FOUR DELS THEN BEGAN DISCUSSION OF THE TYPES OF INFORMATION TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THE CENTRAL REGISTRY. SOVIETS OBJECTED TO US AND CANADA- FRANCE REQUIREMENT FOR TRANSMISSION OF " CONVENTIONAL DESIGNATION OF THE MAIN CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USUN N 01190 01 OF 02 040427 Z

LAUNCHING VEHICLE". KOLOSISOV SAID USSR DOES NOT NAME ITS LAUNCH VEHICLES, AND THEY WOULD NOT BE WILLING TO USE A SIMPLE NUMERICAL SYSTEM SINCE THIS MIGHT REVEAL GAPS WHERE THERE HAD BEEN FAILURES. IF A STATE WISHED TO SUBMIT SUCH INFORMATION, IT COULD DO SO UNDER US "(G) SUCH OTHER INFORMATION AS THE LAUNCHING STATE MAY WISH TO SUBMIT FROM TIME TO TIME." WE SAID WE DID NOT AGREE IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO OMIT THE LAUNCH VEHICLE CONVENTIONAL DESIGNATOR BUT, IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER PROGRESS

COULD BE MADE, WOULD AGREE FOR THE TIME BEING (UNDER-
SCORED) TO THE OMISSION OF THIS PROVISION FROM A DETAILED
LISTING OF WHAT THE FOUR DELS COULD ACCEPT. (SEE BELOW).

5. SOVIETS ALSO OBJECTED TO US AND CANADA- FRANCE
OBLIGATION TO SUBMIT INFORMATION ON " TIME" IN ADDITION TO
" DATE" OF LAUNCH. CANADA- FRANCE AGREED TO DRO TIME;
US DEL SAID WE WOULD NEED TO CONSIDER.

6. USSR OBJECTED TO US AND CANADA- FRANCE " PLACE OF LAUNCH".
US EXPLAINED PER REFTEL A THAT US WOULD NOTIFY LAUNCHES
AS BEING FROM EITHER EASTERN OR WESTERN RANGE BUT
KOLOSsov SAID SOVIETS COULD NOT ACCEPT AN OBLIGATION OTHER
THAN TO IDENTIFY THE COUNTRY FROM WHOSE TERRITORY OR
FACILITY (E. G., HIGH- SEAS BASED) A VEHICLE WAS LAUNCHED;
THEY WOULD NOT BE READY TO NOTIFY A GEOGRAPHIC REGION OF
THE USSR.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 USUN N 01190 02 OF 02 040437 Z

14

ACTION IO-03

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ADP-00 EUR-10 L-02 NSCE-00 NSC-10 INR-09

CIAE-00 NSAE-00 PRS-01 MC-02 OTP-01 ACDA-10 SCI-03

PM-03 DODE-00 NASA-01 GAC-01 RSR-01 RSC-01 INRE-00

/073 W

----- 099907

P R 040350 Z APR 73

FM USMISSION USUN NEWYORK

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 7314

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USUN 1190

7. FRANCE DECLINED TO ACCEPT THE DETAILED PROVISION OF
THE US DRAFT CONCERNING THE USE OF COSPAR DESIGNATIONS.
THE USSR LIKEWISE DECLINED, SAYING IT USES A SERIAL
NUMBERING SYSTEM FOR EACH " CLASS" (COSMOS, MOLNIYA,
ETC.) OF OBJECT. WE SAID WE THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE
TO SUBSTITUTE FOR THE MORE DETAILED PROVISION OF US
ART IV(1)(B)(I) THROUGH (III) SOMETHING LIKE " AN APPROPRIATE
INTERNATIONAL DESIGNATOR OR REGISTRATION NUMBER"
BUT WE WOULD HAVE TO CONSULT WASHINGTON.

8. CANADA AND FRANCE TALKED AT LENGTH ABOUT THE APPARENT ENCOURAGEMENT BY THE US OF DUPLICATORY TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION TO THE UN IN THE CASE OF JOINT SPACE ACTIVITIES. OUR TEXT, THEY SAID, WOULD LEAD TO CONFUSION BY SEEMING TO REQUIRE EACH "LAUNCHING STATE" (AS DEFINED BY US ART I) TO TRANSMIT INFORMATION, AND THERE IS NO NEED FOR THIS. THEY AGAIN PRESSED THEIR PREFERENCE TO USE "STATE OF REGISTRY" RATHER THAN "LAUNCHING STATE" AS THE TREATY'S BASIC OPERATIVE TERM, SAYING THAT UNDER THEIR SCHEME THERE COULD BE ONLY ONE STATE OF REGISTRY. WE SAID WE WANTED TO CONTINUE AT LEAST FOR THE MOMENT IN THE FOUR-POWER DISCUSSION TO USE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 01190 02 OF 02 040437 Z

"LAUNCHING STATE" BUT COULD NOTE, BY WAY OF FOOTNOTE, THAT THIS WAS NOT AGREED. WE SUGGESTED THAT THE PROBLEM OF DUPLICATION MIGHT BE DEALT WITH BY INCLUDING AT THE END OF THE PROVISION LISTING THE TYPES OF INFORMATION TO BE SENT TO THE CENTRAL REGISTRY A STATEMENT THAT WHERE THERE ARE TWO OR MORE LAUNCHING STATES, THEY WILL DESIGNATE ONE WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING THE INFORMATION.

9. CANADIAN DEL WILL CIRCULATE TO THE OTHER THREE DELS AM 4 APRIL A PAPER RECORDING WHAT SEEMED TO BE CAPABLE OF AGREEMENT IN FOREGOING DISCUSSION. IT WILL BE THIN. CANADIAN PAPER SHOULD READ AS FOLLOWS BEGIN QUOTE "EACH LAUNCHING STATE SHALL FURNISH TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION CONCERNING EACH SPACE OBJECT IT LAUNCHES INTO EARTH ORBIT OR BEYOND:

(A) NAME OF LAUNCHING STATE OR STATES
(B) AN APPROPRIATE INTERNATIONAL DESIGNATOR OR REGISTRATION NUMBER
(C) DATE AND TERRITORY OR FACILITY OF LAUNCH
(D), (E), (F), ETC. (TO BE DISCUSSED BY FOUR POWERS 4 APRIL). WHERE THERE ARE TWO OR MORE LAUNCHING STATES IN RESPECT OF ANY SUCH SPACE OBJECT, THEY SHALL DESIGNATE WHICH OF THEM SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING THE FOREGOING INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL. END QUOTE.

10. CANADIAN DEL GAVE OTHER THREE THE TEXT OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED AT FIRST MEETING. THIS IS AS STATED PARA 4 REFTEL B EXCEPT THAT REFTEL B(1) INADVERTENTLY OMITTED THE WORD "EARTH" AND SHOULD READ "(1) EACH SPACE OBJECT LAUNCHED INTO EARTH ORBIT". ALSO, CANADIAN TEXT CONTAINS A FOOTNOTE STATING THAT THE QUESTION WHETHER TO USE "LAUNCHING STATE" OR "LAUNCHING STATE OF REGISTRY" HAS BEEN RESERVED.
PHILLIPS

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: thigpegh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973USUNN01190
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USUN NEWYORK
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730459/abqcdywj.tel
Line Count: 219
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Reference: (A) STATE 060732 NOTAL (B) USUN 1164 NOTAL
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: thigpegh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 15 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <15-Aug-2001 by shawdg>; APPROVED <01-Nov-2001 by thigpegh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: OUTER SPACE LEGAL: FOUR- POWER DISCUSSION ON REGISTRATION TREATY
TAGS: TSPA, PFOR, UN, CA, FR, UR
To: STATE INFO MOSCOW
PARIS
OTTAWA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005